

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1, 4, 6, 22-26, 39, 42-44, 50, and 52-56 are pending. are pending in this application.

### **Rejection of the Claims**

#### **Rejections under 35 USC § 102(b)**

Claims 1, 4-6, 22-26, 45-48, 50, 52-53 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,887,145 to Harari, et al. (“Harari” or “the Harari reference”). Claims 5, and 45-48 have been canceled.

#### **Claim 1**

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s characterization of the Harari reference and characterization of claim 1, Applicant nonetheless amends claim 1 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The current amendment is not meant to narrow claim 1 but merely to add clarity.

Claims 1, as amended, defines an assembly for physically transporting a user profile between computing devices, that includes:

a portable profile storage device having an interface to communicate with a physical key and having a secure memory to securely store the user profile; and

a removable passcode-activated physical key associated with the user that alternately enables access to the user profile in the memory when the physical key

is passcode-activated and coupled with the interface and that disables access to the user profile when removed from the interface,

wherein the portable profile storage device makes the user profile accessible to a computing device if the portable profile storage device is coupled with the computing device, the physical key is coupled with the interface, and a user passcode activates the physical key.

Harari, on the other hand, discloses a removable mother/daughter peripheral card, to achieve solid-state “floppy disk” storage. That is, Harari teaches removable solid-state data storage, where the daughter card has as much storage potential as possible. The Harari system aims to replace magnetic floppy disks with controller-less EEPROMS for data storage on the daughter card (col. 4, lines 6-15). The Harari system can store encrypted data on the daughter card as well, along with a public key. Various hosts can use the public key to encrypt data, but only a host with a corresponding private key can decrypt the data stored on the daughter card (col. 13, line 63-col. 14, line 19). In other words, the daughter card is used as a distribution storage medium (col. 14, line 27), that can be secured.

Harari does not expressly or inherently disclose a passcode-activated physical key, as in Applicant’s claim 1. Harari also does not disclose associating a passcode with a physically removable key, in order to doubly secure a user’s profile with both a removable physical key and a password.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the 35 USC § 102(b) rejection based on the Harari reference be removed, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The current amendment does not narrow claim 4 but merely adds clarity. Claim 4 is also dependent on claim 1, and as amended, defines the assembly of claim 1 wherein the device securely stores a user's data to be made accessible whenever the user profile is made accessible.

Harari does not disclose making a user's securely stored data available when the user's profile is made available via a portable device secured by a physical key that is also passcode-protected.

For this reason and for the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 4 is patentable over the Harari reference.

Claim 6

Claim 6 is amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The current amendment does not narrow claim 6 but merely adds clarity. Claim 6 is also dependent on claim 1, and as amended, defines the assembly as recited in claim 1, wherein the portable profile storage device stores a public encryption key, the physical key stores a corresponding private decryption key, and access to the user profile in the secure memory is enabled upon verification that the public key and the private key are associated and the user passcode activates the physical key.

Thus, in Applicant's claim 6, a user profile being transported between computing devices is afforded the triple protection of a removable physical key, a private decryption key on the physical key, and passcode-protection for activating

the physical key. Harari does not disclose associating a private key with a removable physical key, which in turn is also password protected.

For these reasons and for the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 6 is patentable over the Harari reference.

Claim 22

Claim 22 is amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The current amendment does not narrow claim 22 but merely adds clarity. Claim 22, as amended, defines a computer, including:

a PCMCIA device reader; and  
a smart card secured memory assembly physically sized in a form factor of a PCMCIA card to compatibly interface with the PCMCIA device reader in the computer, the smart card secured memory assembly having data memory to store a user profile and a passcode-protected removable smart card that alternately enables access to the user profile when present and activated via the passcode and that disables access to the user profile when removed.

Harari does not expressly or inherently teach a passcode-protected removable smart card to secure a memory storing a portable user profile. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the 35 USC § 102(b) rejection based on the Harari reference be removed, and that claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 23-26

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 22, Applicant submits that claims 23-26 are patentable over the Harari reference. Dependent

claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 23-26 depend from claim 22. Therefore, claims 23-26 are also allowable.

Claim 50

Claim 50 is amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The current amendment does not narrow claim 50 but merely adds clarity. Claim 50, as amended, defines a personal information carry on assembly for physically transporting a profile of a computing device user between a computing network and a standalone computing device, including:

removable means for storing data files;

an interface on the removable means for communicatively coupling and uncoupling with the computing network or the standalone computing device; and

detachable means for enabling passcode-protected access to data files on the removable means when the detachable means communicatively attaches to the removable means,

wherein the removable means includes a flash memory, and the data files include a user profile to configure the computing network and the standalone computing device.

Harari does not expressly or inherently disclose all of claim 50's elements, for example, removable means for storing data files having the capability to couple with a passcode-protected detachable means for enabling password-protected access to the data files on the removable means. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the 35 USC § 102(b) rejection based on the Harari reference be removed, and that claim 50 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 52-53

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 50, Applicant submits that claims 52-53 are patentable over the Harari reference. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 52-53 depend from claim 50. Therefore, claims 52-53 are also allowable.

**Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 39-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harari in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,354 to Ban et al (“Ban” or “the Ban reference”). Claims 40-41 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant has established invention of the subject matter of the presently rejected claims prior to the April 5, 1999 filing date of Ban, in a Rule 131 Declaration filed with the previous response to an Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) may be improper and that the Office has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Nonetheless, Claim 39 is amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The current amendment is not meant to narrow claim 39 but merely to add clarity.

Claim 39, as amended, defines an assembly, including:

a USB-compatible memory to store a user profile; and  
a passcode-protected removable physical key to enable access to the user profile on the memory when the physical key communicatively interfaces with the memory.

The Harari and Ban references, either singly or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest claim 39's subject matter of a passcode-protected, removable, physical key for controlling access to a user profile on a removable memory.

Applicant therefore requests that the 35 USC § 103(a) rejection based on Harari, Ban, or their combination, be removed, and respectfully requests that claim 39 be allowed.

#### Claims 42-44

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 39, Applicant submits that claims 42-44 are patentable over the Harari and Ban references. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 42-44 depend from claim 39. Therefore, claims 42-44 are also allowable.

#### New Claims

#### Claims 54-56

Claim 54 has been added to define a secure apparatus for physically transporting a user's profile between computing devices. Claim 55 has been added to define a driver and claim 56 has been added to define a logon module. The new claims are supported by the specification and no new matter is added.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully suggests that pending claims 1, 4, 6, 22-26, 39, 42-44, 50, and 52-56 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 4-5-05

By:   
Lee & Hayes PLLC  
Mark C. Farrell  
Reg. No. 45,988  
(509) 324-9256